

II. Statement of the Substance of the Interview

Applicant, their licensee's representatives Dr. Poolman and Mr. Lubienski, and the undersigned express their appreciation to Examiner Devi for the courtesy of the personal interview of April 10, 2008. The recordation of the substance of the interview is provided by the amendments and remarks herein:

(1) *a brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:*

No exhibits were presented by Applicants. Dr. Poolman's curriculum vitae was presented informally to Examiner Devi.

(2) *an identification of the claims discussed:*

Primarily, we discussed the independent claims 50 and 55 and claim language therein.

(3) *an identification of specific prior art discussed:*

The examiner referenced generally the 1997 publications of Manning (Items BJ and BK cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 22, 2003). However, these references were not specifically applied to the claims at the interview.

(4) *an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed:*

We discussed amending Claims 50 and 55 to read: "...interfere with the ability adherence of Neisseria gonorrhoeae bacteria to adhere to mammalian epithelial cells in a as measured by the gonococcal cell adherence assay." The above amendment is consistent with the examiner's suggestion.

We discussed the issue of 95% identity as used in Claim 50 being supported by evidence in the specification of that identity between SEQ ID NO: 4 and SEQ ID NO: 2. We discussed a proposed amendment to 90% identity using Figs. 3, 4 and 7 for support thereof.

Also discussed was support in the specification for "fragments" of OMP85 (SEQ ID NO: 4) as used in Claim 55.

(5) *a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner:*

Regarding the proposed amendment of Claims 50 and 55, Applicants agreed and have presented the same in this amendment. Regarding the issue of identity lesser than 95%, the thrust of Applicants' arguments is stated in this Amendment. With regard to support for the terms "fragment" and "epitope" as used in Claim 55, the argument discussed was as substantially stated in this response.

(6) *a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed:*

Examiner Devi inquired whether a terminal disclaimer over parent US Patent No. 6,610,306 was previously filed in this prosecution. Yes, such a terminal disclaimer was filed on September 21, 2006 and is in the image file wrapper of this application.

The examiner indicated that data demonstrating that degree of identity as between SEQ ID NO: 4 and the sequences of the OMPs of the bacterial species identified in the figures would be reviewed if available. Applicants agreed to determine if they were in possession of any such data.

(7) *the general results or outcome:*

No agreement was reached, but the Examiner indicated that she would permit a supplemental amendment of the claims, if filed by May 1, 2008.